

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/458,602

**Applicant(s)**

PAGAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

BEEHNET DADA

**Art Unit**

2435

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 56-70, 77-83, 87-94, 96 and 98-147 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 56-70, 77-83, 87-94, 96 and 98-147 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF 298)
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on October 19, 2011. Claims 56-61, 63-67, 69, 70, 77-83, 87-94, 96, 98, 100 and 101 have been amended and new claims 102-147 have been added. Claims 56-70, 77-83, 87-94, 96, 98-147 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/19/2011 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 56-70, 77-83, 87-94, 96, 98-147 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell et al. US 5,805,803 (hereinafter Birrell) in view of Reiche US 6,092,196 and further in view of Bennett et al. US 6,122,670 (hereinafter Bennett).

As per claims 56, 63, 77, 87, 98, 99-102, 106, 108-111, 113, 115-121, 123-125, 127, 129-136, 138, 139 and 144-147, Birrell teaches a method of managing access to network resources, the method being performed by a network management system in communication with a portable communication device via a network, the method comprising:

receiving, at a communications port of a network management system from a portable communication device via a network, a first request to access a network resource located at an external server (i.e., private resources 160, fig 2), the first request comprising one or more network packets, which include header and body data (i.e., http/https request from browser to proxy server/redirector, column 4, lines 5-23), and being configured with attributes (i.e., http request with token/cookie, column 4, lines 47-49);

determining, using a processor, whether to provide the portable communication device with access to the network resource, the determination being based at least in part on comparing one or more of the attributes included in the first request to a user profile database (i.e., determining if the client is known, the determination based at least in part on validating token/cookie received with a request, column 4, lines 18-26 and 47-51); and

upon determining that the portable communication device is not to be provided with access to the network resource, redirecting the portable communication device to an authentication system (i.e., if the client is unknown, redirect the client to checker 141, column 4, lines 23-28), by receiving, from the redirection server (i.e., proxy server 143), redirection data comprising a resource identification data that identifies the authentication system (i.e., step 204, of figure 2, https message with ../checker/...), the redirection data configured to cause the portable communication device to be redirected to the authentication system (i.e., redirection of the client to checker for authentication, column 4, lines 23-31); and

sending, from the communications port of the network management system to the portable communication device, a browser redirect message based upon the redirection data [column 4, lines 23-31];

whereby the portable communication device is enabled, by being redirected to the authentication system, to provide authentication related information so that the portable communication system may be provided access to the network resource [column 4, lines 52-57].

In the same field of endeavor Reiche teaches a remote user authentication system including: a first request to access network resource, wherein request being configured with attributes including a source address and a checksum (i.e., client request, including IP address and checksum, column 9, lines 57-65);

comparing one or more of the attributes included in the first request to a user profile database (i.e., comparing the client IP address against those stored in memory, column 9, lines 57-67 and column 8, lines 64-column 9, line 3 and column 6, lines 21-37);

redirecting the client to an authentication system, the browser redirect message configured to indicate that it was sent by the network resource (i.e., redirection process that is transparent to the client, column 9, lines 6-11) and comprises attributes in which at least one of a source address and a checksum (the checksum allowing for verifying correct data transmission), and a port number differs from those attributes of the first request (i.e., redirect message including address of authentication server and not IP address of the client, column 5, lines 6-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Reiche within the system of Birrell in order to enhance security of the system.

Furthermore, Bennett teaches a TCP/IP protocol communication system, wherein packet transmission includes attributes including a source address, a checksum (the checksum allowing for verifying correct data transmission), and a port number, wherein the checksum is calculated based at least in part on header and body data of one or more network packets [column 6, line 44-column 7, line 12].

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Bennett within the combination of Reiche and Birrell in order to process packet transmission/request by TCP/IP based protocol thereby enhancing efficiency of the system.

As per claims 57 and 78, Reiche further teaches the method further comprising updating the user profile database upon determining that the portable communication device is entitled to access the requested network resource [column 9, lines 45-55].

As per claims 58, 64, 79 and 88, Reiche further teaches the method further comprising maintaining in the user profile database a historical log of the portable communication device's access to the destination network [column 9, lines 45-55].

As per claims 59, 65, 80 and 89, Birrell further teaches the method wherein the request is an HTTP request [column 4, lines 5-23].

As per claims 60, 66, 81 and 90, Reiche further teaches the method wherein determining whether to authorize the portable communication device to access the requested network resource further comprises denying the portable communication device access where the user profile database indicates that the portable communication device may not access the destination network [column 8, lines 53-64, column 9, lines 57-67 and column 10, lines 39-49].

As per claims 61, 67, 82 and 91, Reiche further teaches the method wherein the attribute included in the request is one of a port, circuit ID, VLAN ID or MAC address [column 9, lines 45-65].

As per claims 62, 68, 83 and 92, Reiche further teaches the method further comprising: receiving, from the portable communication device, a second request to access a second network resource, and determining that the portable communication device is authorized to access the second network resource, based at least upon a MAC address included in the second request [column 10, lines 39-64].

As per claims 69 and 93, Reiche further teaches the method wherein the user profile database further stores information relating to an authorized time period associated with the portable communication device, and wherein the determination of whether the portable communication device is authorized to access the requested network resource is further based on an amount of time that has elapsed in relation to the authorized time period stored in the user profile database [column 9, lines 45-67].

As per claims 70 and 94, Reiche further teaches the method wherein the attribute included in the request comprises a link-layer header of a network packet and wherein the determination of whether the portable communication device is authorized to access the requested network resource is based on the link-layer header of the network packet and on identification information provided automatically by a browser of the portable communication device [column 9, lines 35-67].

As per claim 96, Birrell further teaches the system wherein the first request comprises a TCP packet to open a connection [column 4, lines 5-23].

As per claims 103, 122 and 137, Birrell further teaches the method wherein the portable communication device is redirected to the authentication system by further communicating request data to the redirection server, the request data being based on the first request [figures 2 and 3].

As per claims 104, 116, 126 and 140-142, Birrell further teaches the method wherein determining whether to provide the portable communication device with access to the network resource comprises determining whether the portable communication device is authorized to access the requested network resource [column 4, lines 18-26 and 47-51].

As per claims 105 and 112 Birrell further teaches the method wherein the first request is configured with network settings that do not correspond to the network [column 4, lines 18-26].

As per claims 107, 114, 128 and 143, Birrell further teaches the method further comprising communicating a modified request to a redirection server, the modified request being based upon the first request to access the network resource [figures 2 and 3].

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BEEEMNET DADA whose telephone number is (571)272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BEEEMNET DADA/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2435